

and deflect any and all rumors that individuals in the administration may have been involved at any level in the prison abuse scandal.

Mr. Speaker, there must be a better way, because the current method of hiding prisoners from humanitarian agencies and using vicious attack dogs to help conduct so-called prisoner interrogations is further hindering the war on terror and encouraging anti-American sentiment around the world. That is why I have introduced H. Con. Res. 3792, a SMART security platform for the 21st century. My SMART plan will keep America safe.

SMART stands for sensible multi-lateral American response to terrorism. SMART means interrogation, not torture. It encourages open government, not a secretive government that fails to investigate and covers its own back. SMART security encourages negotiations and leadership, not aggression and unilateralism. SMART invests in developmental and humanitarian aid for the most impoverished nations, not an expensive and unproven missile defense system and certainly not the inhumane treatment of prisoners.

The situation in Iraq requires the best America has to offer. SMART security, accordingly, relies on the very best of America, our commitment to peace and freedom, our compassion for the people of the world, and our capacity for multi-lateral leadership. SMART security treats war as a last resort to be considered only after every diplomatic alternative has been exhausted, and it controls the widespread use of weapons of mass destruction with a renewed commitment of non-proliferation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH FOR OUR CHURCHES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have been on the floor for the last 3 or 4 years from time to time to talk about the need, the importance

of having our spiritual leaders in America to have freedom of speech, to speak on a Sunday or Saturday and talk about the moral and political issues of the day. This year has probably been one of the worst I have seen as far as the attack on people of faith in this great Nation.

Let me read from the St. Petersburg Times, an article from today. It says, "As the political influence of churches grows, opponents are wielding the Tax Code as a weapon against them."

State Representative Arthenia Joyner, a Tampa Democrat who is African American, she says, "It could have a chilling effect. I see it as a way to try to intimidate people, but I think it's not going to work."

I would say to Representative Joyner she is exactly right. That is why I hope that she and many other people, both here in the Congress as well as other State representatives, will get behind this effort to return the freedom of speech to our churches and synagogues.

A lot of people do not know the history, but prior to 1954 any speech or sermon by a minister, priest or rabbi in this great Nation was protected by the first amendment rights.

In 1954 Lyndon Baines Johnson's amendment on a revenue bill going through the Senate basically stifled our churches because our churches are 501(c)(3)s. Well, it seemed like not really much of a law that was enforced until the early 1970s and mid-1980s, when the moral majority got involved in campaigns. When I say got involved in campaigns, I meant speaking out about the moral issues of the day and saying to their congregation who stands for protecting morality. But what has happened even this year in the last 3 months? First of all a Catholic bishop, Bishop Sheridan in Colorado Springs wrote a pastoral letter to 125,000 Catholics. He said nothing about President Bush or Senator KERRY. He did use the word "pro-life."

You might say, well, what is wrong with that? That is what the Catholic church stands for. That is what many churches stand for and also synagogues. Well, the problem is that the Internal Revenue Service has said because of the Johnson amendment there are certain code words that cannot be used. Because Bishop Sheridan used the word "pro-life" in his pastoral letter, Barry Lynn with the American Center for the Separation of Church and State filed a complaint. In addition to that, he has filed a complaint against a Reverend Ronnie Floyd, a Baptist minister in Arkansas. He is now with a group of 100 volunteers monitoring churches in Kansas each Sunday to see what the minister might be saying about morality and might be saying about how we can protect the Judeo-Christian principles of America.

I want to say to Representative Joyner that she is exactly right. The great movements of this country, such as Martin Luther King and the civil rights movement never would have

happened if it had not been for the churches. The churches do have a role in this Nation and our synagogues, and that is to ensure and to help protect morality.

So I am hoping this year that maybe the House will look seriously at this legislation that has been introduced. We have 164 co-sponsors. It is time to protect the moral future of America, and the way that is going to happen is with our spiritual leaders of America being free with the first amendment rights that are guaranteed by the men and women serving this great Nation in Iraq and Afghanistan.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say again that a nation built on Judeo-Christian principles, if it is going to survive, then we have got to be able to have our spiritual leaders speaking freely with the first amendment rights.

With that I would like to make one close and then I will finish. I first ask that the good Lord bless our men and women in uniform and their families, and I do ask the good Lord to please bless America. America is in trouble and we need the blessings of our Lord and Savior.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

SHAMEFUL MEDICARE INCREASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, President Bush said about a year ago he would veto any Medicare bill that cost taxpayers more than \$400 billion. The President then signed a bill that cost \$551 billion. His Medicare Administrator, who had lied to Congress, who had not shared any of this information as they continued to say it was \$400 billion to people on both sides of the aisle, his Medicare Administrator knew the true bill's cost long before the President signed it, and you have got to think that the President knew what the bill cost since the Medicare Administrator works for the President, that the President knew what the bill cost before he picked up his pen and signed that legislation late last year.

Seniors would have been outraged had they known that this bloated bill that the President signed would have increased their Medicare premiums 17 percent. Imagine that, the Medicare premiums that seniors have paid, they have fluctuated a little over the years, but imagine a 17 percent increase, the largest increase in Medicare premiums in Medicare history. Thirty-eight years of Medicare, never an increase like this. But seniors would obviously have been outraged to know that Republicans in Congress and the Administrator not only made this happen by passing that bill, but that the President and the administration and the Republican leadership knew that this increase was going to happen because of this bill.

But, of course, this increase happened. Of course, George Bush had to push forward and announce a 17 percent increase. Why? Because of the increased subsidies in the Medicare bill for the insurance industry, for the HMOs. The health maintenance organizations had a 50 percent profit increase last year, yet we are subsidizing them additionally under this bill to the tune of billions of dollars. So, of course, we have to take money out of seniors' pockets in increased Medicare premiums and then turn that money over to Medicare HMOs.

Here is how it works. In this Medicare bill that Congress passed last year, a year ago, starting in March 2004, Medicare HMOs got from taxpayers \$229 million. In April they got \$229 million. Still no Medicare drug benefit, which does not go into effect until 2006, but the HMOs were getting subsidized by the Federal Government.

In June, \$229 million. In July \$229 million from seniors and taxpayers to the Medicare HMOs, to the health maintenance organizations, yet still no Medicare drug benefit. July \$229 million. August \$229 million. This month, \$229 million more, and still no prescription drug benefit for seniors. September, October, November, December and all of next year Medicare HMOs, private insurance companies, will continue to get a subsidy from the Federal Government of \$229 million extra that they were not getting before this Medicare bill took effect.

Of course, the President had to increase premiums 17 percent to pay these insurance companies subsidies. Why would the President raise Medicare premiums to give money to insurance companies? Well, it might be the fact that insurance companies have given tens of millions of dollars to the President's reelection, tens of millions of dollars to my friends on the other side of the aisle. It might have something to do, too, with the fact that this Medicare bill was written by the drug companies, written by the insurance companies.

Drug company profits will go up \$180 billion over the next 10 years because of this prescription drug bill. Insurance companies subsidies, subsidies directly

from seniors through higher premiums and taxpayers will go up literally tens of billions of dollars to those insurance companies, to those HMOs.

The whole Medicare bill, middle of the night debate, vote at 6 o'clock in the morning after the rolls were kept open for 3 hours. One Republican Member accused his own leadership of trying to bribe him on the House floor; arm twisting in the middle of the night; and then the secrecy of trying to foist this 17 percent Medicare increase by announcing it sort of under the cover of darkness, late in the afternoon, right before Labor Day weekend; the secrecy of this whole administration, and ultimately the payoff that this Medicare bill has done, the payoff to the drug and insurance industries because of political contributions.

Remember, a 17 percent increase; a record in the history of Medicare; never an increase this big; 17 percent, the largest premium increase in Medicare history in order to subsidize the insurance companies, in order to give even bigger profits to this country's drug companies.

Mr. Speaker, it is shameful.

□ 1400

HONORING THE LIFE OF FLOYD ALEXANDER PINYAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Floyd Alexander Pinyan, a good and honorable American, Georgian, family man and Marine. He passed away on August 27, 2004. He was my constituent in the 11th District of Georgia.

His family has described him as a kind Christian man who raised his children to know the difference between right and wrong. By the family's accounts, it is clear that they were the most important thing in his life. Mrs. Pinyan said she could not have asked for a more wonderful, caring, loving husband than Floyd. She has always admired the respect and love her husband had for others; and if someone asked him for help, he was going to "move mountains" to assist them.

The day after Pearl Harbor, Mr. Pinyan and his brothers enlisted in the armed services. Initially, Floyd tried to enlist in the Navy, but he was turned down because of problems with his feet. Undeterred, he then went to the Marines; and when he asked the recruiter, What are the Marines, the recruiter replied, Sign here and you'll find out.

Mr. Pinyan served honorably with the United States Marines in the Pacific Theatre during World War II, specifically in Guam, Iwo Jima, and China. He also served in Korea and Vietnam and retired after 41 years of distinguished service. Upon retirement, he held the rank of gunnery sergeant.

Floyd Pinyan remained active after his retirement from the Marines, working for the city of Atlanta as a business license inspector for some 15 years.

Mr. Pinyan is survived by his wife of 53 years, Christine; sons, Charles and Carl; daughter, Sharon; eight grandchildren; and five great-grandchildren. His children have continued his honorable service to our country by joining the Army, the Navy and the Marines.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that all of my colleagues join me in honoring the life of Floyd Pinyan of Cobb County, Mableton, Georgia, and in sending our thoughts and prayers to his family.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4885

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 4885.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THE ESSENCE OF SCIENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about a matter that should be important to us all, regardless of political persuasion, and that is, the matter of scientific integrity, which I believe is under profound and dangerous attack under this administration and unfortunately under this Congress.

The great Nobel Prize winning physicist Richard Feynman once observed that as scientists we have "a lot of experience with ignorance, doubt and uncertainty. We have found it of paramount importance" he wrote "that in order to progress we must recognize our ignorance and leave room for doubt. Scientific knowledge is a body of statements of varying degrees of certainty, some most unsure, some nearly sure, but none absolutely certain."

Feynman saw this familiarity with uncertainty, with doubt as an important strength, indeed a responsibility that scientists can offer to the society as a whole. He went on to say, "If we suppress all discussion, all criticism, proclaiming 'This is the answer, my friends; man is saved!' we will" in the process "doom humanity for a long time to the chains of authority, confined to the limits of our present imagination." Feynman asserted, "It has been done so many times before."

Feynman was right. It has been done so many times before; and I believe if he were with us today, he would say it is being done yet again. In countless subtle and not-so-subtle ways, this administration and the majorities in the House and the Senate are deliberately and systematically suppressing discussion and criticism and distorting the scientific process. The modalities of